

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 63 were presented for examination and were rejected.

Claims 4, 5, 7, 10 through 13, 23 through 35, 48, 49, 51, and 53 through 63 have been canceled.

New claims 64 through 75 have been added.

Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 45, 50, and 52 have been amended to more clearly distinguish the present invention from the prior art.

The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments and the following comments.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejection of Claims 1 through 63

Claims 1 through 63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by M. Vanska, et al., U.S. Patent 7,072,667, issued July 4, 2006 (hereinafter "Vanska"). The applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, overcome the rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A method comprising:
receiving at a mobile telecommunications terminal a command that *reads the value of a datum*; and
determining whether to execute said command based on *the geo-location of said mobile telecommunications terminal and on said value*.
(*emphasis supplied*)

Nowhere does Vanska teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what claim 1 recites – namely receiving at a mobile terminal a command to read the value of a datum (e.g., John Smith's account balance, *etc.*), and determining whether to execute the command based on the terminal's geo-location and on the datum's value. The present invention as recited in claim 1 can be used, for example, to prevent a user from accessing John Smith's account balance from his or her mobile terminal unless the terminal is located inside the bank and the account balance is less than one million dollars.

In contrast, Vanska teaches a mobile terminal in which an application can only be activated if one or more conditions – referred to as "trigger parameters" or rules – are satisfied. While Vanska does mention that these conditions could include the geo-location of the mobile terminal, Vanska suffers from a number of deficiencies. First, Vanska is concerned with conditions for the downloading, activation, or deactivation of an application

[Col. 3 lines 35-40] – not the execution of an application that has already been downloaded and activated. Second, the present invention is concerned with restricting the execution of individual commands within an application – not applications in their entirety. Third, the present invention is concerned with preventing the unauthorized execution of commands based on a terminal's geo-location and, optionally, other conditions, while Vanska teaches something different: applications that enable access to a service only at a particular location [Col. 1, lines 47-49]. Fourth, Vanska teaches nothing about preventing the reading of the value of a datum – let alone determining whether to prevent the reading based on what the datum's value is.

For this multitude of reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 1, as amended, is overcome.

Because claims 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9 depend on claim 1, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of them is also overcome.

Claim 14 recites:

14. A method comprising:
receiving at a mobile telecommunications terminal a request to access content; and
determining a *version of said content* to access based on the geo-location of said mobile telecommunications terminal.
(*emphasis supplied*)

Nowhere does Vanska teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what claim 14 recites – namely receiving a request from a mobile terminal to access content, and determining what version of the content to transmit to the terminal based on the terminal's geo-location. The present invention can be used, for example, to provide a user with an edited version of a video clip when the user is in a church, and an unedited version of the video clip when the user is at home.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office's assertion that Vanska teaches the limitations of the second part of claim 14 in Col. 8 line 58 – Col. 9 line 5 or in Col. 10 lines 31-47. Applicant respectfully submits that Vanska doesn't teach anything about versions of content anywhere in the entire patent application.

For these reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 14 is traversed.

Because claims 15 through 22 depend on claim 14, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of them is also traversed.

Claim 36 recites:

36. A method comprising:
transmitting from a mobile telecommunications terminal a request to access remote content; and
receiving at said mobile telecommunications terminal *a version of said remote content* that is based on the geo-location of said mobile telecommunications terminal.
(*emphasis supplied*)

For the same reasons as for claim 14, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 36 is traversed.

Because claims 37 through 44 depend on claim 36, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of them is also traversed.

Claim 45, as amended, recites:

45. A method comprising:
receiving at a mobile telecommunications terminal a command that *reads the value of a datum*; and
determining whether to execute said command based on the geo-location of said mobile telecommunications terminal and on said datum.

For the same reasons as for claim 1, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 45 is overcome.

Because claims 46, 47, 50, and 52 depend on claim 45, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of them is also overcome.

New claim 64 recites:

64. A method comprising:
receiving at a mobile telecommunications terminal a command that updates the value of a datum; and
determining whether to execute said command based on the geo-location of said mobile telecommunications terminal and on said value prior to updating.

For the same reasons as for claim 1, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 64 is allowable.

Because claims 65 through 70 depend on claim 64, the applicant respectfully submits that they are also allowable.

New claim 71 recites:

71. A method comprising:
receiving at a mobile telecommunications terminal a command that reads the value of a datum; and
determining whether to execute said command based on the geo-location of said mobile telecommunications terminal and on the geo-location at which said value is stored.

In addition to the first three reasons given above for claim 1, claim 71 is also patentable over Vanska for a fourth reason: namely, that Vanska teaches nothing about preventing the reading of the value of a datum – let alone determining whether to prevent the reading based on the geo-location at which the value is stored (*i.e.*, the server, disk array, *etc.* where the value is stored).

For these reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 71 is allowable.

Because claims 72 through 75 depend on claim 71, the applicant respectfully submits that they are also allowable.

Request for Reconsideration Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the Office action mailed November 29, 2006, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and request that the Examiner allow all of the pending claims and pass the application to issue.

If there are remaining issues, the applicant respectfully requests that Examiner telephone the applicants' attorney at 732-578-0103 x11 so that those issues can be resolved as quickly as possible.

Serial No. 10/816511

Attorney Docket: 630-067US
Avaya Docket: 501034-M-01-US

Respectfully,
Doree Duncan Seligmann

By **/Jason Paul DeMont/**
Reg. No. 35793
Attorney for Applicants
732-578-0103 x11

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.
Suite 250
100 Commons Way
Holmdel, NJ 07733
United States of America